Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JAN 4 1989
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. 88-960 (3)

In The
Supreme Court Of The United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1988

LIBERTY MOBILEHOME SALES, INC.,
Appellant,

v.

STEPHEN EAMIELLO, ET UX.,
Appellees.

ON APPEAL FROM THE
SUPREME COURT OF CONNECTICUT

MOTION TO DISMISS OR AFFIRM

Attorney for Appellee:

EDWARD G. FITZPATRICK, ESQ.
175 Church Street
Naugatuck, Connecticut 06770
Tel: (203) 729-4555

Counsel of Record

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the Connecticut Supreme Court correctly held that statutory modification of the common law right of a landlord to absolute control over the term of the lease and the identity of the tenant does not constitute a taking in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTION PRESENTED

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

STATE STATUTES INVOLVED 2

ARGUMENT 4

THE APPEAL WAS NOT TIMELY FILED 4

THE CASE PRESENTS NO SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL QUESTION 4

The Decision Below Does Not Conflict With This Court's Decision In *Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.* 4

The Decision Below Does Not Conflict With *Hall v. City of Santa Barbara* 10

The Mobile Home Act Is Well Within The Legitimate Police Power 12

CONCLUSION 15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases: **Page(s)**

Armstrong v. United States, 314 U.S. 40, 80 S.Ct. 1563 (1960) 13

Ballstaedt v. Amoco Oil Co., 509 F. Supp. 1095 (N.D. Iowa 1981) 8

Block v. Hirsh, 256 U.S. 135, 41 S.Ct. 458 (1921) 8, 9, 14

Connolly v. Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp., 106 S.Ct. 1018 (1986) 13

Eamiello v. Liberty Mobile Home Sales, Inc., 208 Conn. 620, 546 A.2d 805 (1980) ..... *passim*

Edgar A. Levy Leasing Co. v. Siegel, 258 U.S. 242, 42 S.Ct. 289 (1921) 9

Edgewater Inv. Ass'n v. Borough of Edgewater, 493 A.2d 11 (N.J. Super. App. Div. 1985), *aff'd*, 510 A.2d 117 (N.J. 1986) 6

Exxon Corp. v. Governor of Maryland, 437 U.S. 117, 98 S.Ct. 2207 (1978) 14

F.C.C. v. Florida Power Corp., 107 S.Ct. 1107 (1987) 5, 7

Fresh Pond Shopping Center, Inc. v. Callahan, 464 U.S. 875, 104 S.Ct. 218 (1983) 5, 8, 10

Hall v. City of Santa Barbara, 833 F.2d 1270 (9th Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 108 S.Ct. 1120 (1988) 10, 11, 12

Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff, 467 U.S. 229, 104 S.Ct. 2321 (1984) 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

Cases: **Page(s)**

Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States, 379 U.S. 241, 85 S.Ct. 348 (1964) 10

Help Hoboken Housing v. City of Hoboken, 650 F. Supp. 793 (D.N.J. 1986) 6

Hilton Washington Corp. v. District of Columbia, 777 F.2d 47 (D.C. Cir. 1985) 8, 10

Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp., 458 U.S. 419, 102 S.Ct. 3164 (1982) . . . . . *passim*

Marcus Brown Holding Co. v. Feldman, 256 U.S. 170, 41 S.Ct. 465 (1921) 9

Matter of Review of Health Care Admin., 415 A.2d 1147 (N.J.) *cert. denied*, 449 U.S. 944, 101 S.Ct. 342 (1980) 8

Minnesota Ass'n of Health Care Facilities, Inc. v. Minnesota Dept. of Public Welfare, 742 F.2d 442 (8th Cir. 1984) *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1215, 105 S.Ct. 1191 (1985) 8

Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 107 S.Ct. 3141 (1987) 6

Pennell v. City of San Jose, 108 S.Ct. 849 (1988) 5, 12, 14

Pruneyard Shopping Center v. Robins, 447 U.S. 74, 100 S.Ct. 2035 (1980) 10

Sadowsky v. City of New York, 732 F.2d 312 (2d Cir. 1984) 5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

Cases: **Page(s)**

State of Louisiana, ex rel. Allen v. Walker, 365 U.S. 567, 81 S.Ct. 755 (1961) 4

Swann v. Gastonia Housing Authority, 675 F.2d 1342 (4th Cir. 1982) 8

Taggart v. New York, 392 U.S. 667, 88 S.Ct. 2317 (1968) 4

Territo v. United States, 358 U.S. 279, 79 S.Ct. 312 (1959) 4

Tirolerland, Inc. v. Lake Placid 1980 Olympic Games, Inc., 592 F. Supp. 304 (N.D.N.Y. 1984) 6, 10

Troy Ltd. v. Renna, 727 F.2d 287 (3d Cir. 1984) . 5, 8, 9, 10

Statutes:

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-64 2

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-79 . . . . . 2, 3, 4, 8, 13

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-79(a) 2, 7

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-79(b) 2

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-79(d) 2, 7, 9

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b) 2, 9

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b)(1) 2

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b)(1)(A) 2

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b)(1)(B) 2

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b)(1)(C) 2, 8

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b)(1)(D) 2

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b)(1)(E) 2, 8

No. 88-960

In The

Supreme Court Of The United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1988

LIBERTY MOBILEHOME SALES, INC.,
Appellant,

v.

STEPHEN EAMIELLO, ET UX.,
Appellees.

ON APPEAL FROM THE
SUPREME COURT OF CONNECTICUT

MOTION TO DISMISS OR AFFIRM

Pursuant to Rule 16.1, the appellee, Stephen Eamiello, moves the Court to dismiss the appeal filed on behalf of the appellant Liberty Mobilehome Sales, Inc., or in the alternative, to affirm the judgment of the Supreme Court of Connecticut on the grounds that:

1. The appeal was not timely filed; and

2. It is manifest that the questions raised are so unsubstantial as not to need further argument.

STATE STATUTES INVOLVED

This appeal involves certain sections of the Connecticut Mobile Manufactured Homes and Mobile Manufactured Home Parks, Owners and Residents Act, Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 21-64 *et seq.* (the "Mobile Home Act").

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b)(1) regulates eviction of tenants who own their mobile homes and rent space from the park owner. The landlord may evict for cause, including: nonpayment of rent; material noncompliance with the tenant's statutory obligations; material noncompliance with the rental agreement and the landlord's rules and regulations. Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 21-80(b)(1)(A), (B) and (C).

Further, the landlord may evict for two reasons unrelated to tenant misconduct. Where the tenant fails to agree to a proposed rent increase, the landlord may evict upon expiration of the term of the existing rental agreement. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b)(1)(D). Where the landlord desires to cease use of his property as a mobile home park and put it to other use, he may do so and evict the tenant upon a one year notice. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b)(1)(E).

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-79 regulates the tenant's right to sell the mobile home in the mobile home park, and the landlord's right to approve such sale. Section 21-79(a) permits the tenant to sell his mobile home within the park upon the conditions that the mobile home is safe, sanitary, in conformance with aesthetic standards of the park, and that the purchaser be bound by any rental agreement of the seller-tenant and rules and regulations of the park. Section 21-79(b) allows the landlord to approve or disapprove the condition of the mobile home for resale within the park.

Section 21-79(d) permits the purchaser of an approved mobile home to become a resident of the park, upon the condition that he meets the landlord's entry requirements and the landlord approves the entry. The landlord may refuse

entry upon reasonable belief that the purchaser will use the mobile home for illegal or immoral purposes, will disturb the quiet enjoyment of other tenants, or will be financially unable to pay rent.

Nothing in section 21-79 allows the tenant or purchaser to replace an existing mobile home by locating a different mobile home in the park without the landlord's consent.

ARGUMENT

THE APPEAL WAS NOT TIMELY FILED

The judgment below was entered on August 16, 1988, by the Connecticut Supreme Court. Appellant filed its Notice of Appeal in the Connecticut Supreme Court on November 17, 1988, more than ninety days after entry of the judgment below. (See certification of Administrative Assistant to the Connecticut Supreme Court submitted under separate cover.) An appeal is timely only when filed with the Court from whose judgment the appeal is taken within the time allowed by law. 28 U.S.C. § 2101(c); Sup. Ct. R. 10.3, 11.2. Failure to timely file the appeal deprives the Court of jurisdiction. *Taggart v. New York*, 392 U.S. 667, 88 S.Ct. 2317 (1968); *State of Louisiana ex rel. Allen v. Walker*, 365 U.S. 567, 81 S.Ct. 755 (1961); *Territo v. United States*, 358 U.S. 279, 79 S.Ct. 312 (1959); Sup. Ct. R. 12.1. The appeal should therefore be dismisssed.

THE CASE PRESENTS NO SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL QUESTION

The Decision Below Does Not Conflict With This Court's Decision In *Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*

Appellant contends that a *per se* taking analysis should apply to the Connecticut Mobile Home Act. However, after a lengthy analysis of the extant Supreme Court authority, the Connecticut Supreme Court held:

> We conclude that § 21-79 as applied to the facts of this case does not involve the actual physical occupation of land for a public purpose, but merely regulates the use to which private property may be put.

Eamiello v. Liberty Mobile Home Sales, Inc., 208 Conn. 620, 645, 546 A.2d 805, 818 (1988). The Connecticut Supreme Court correctly applied a multifactor balancing test to the Connecticut statutory scheme regulating the relations between mobile home landlords and tenants, and rejected application of the *per se* rule of *Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*, 458 U.S. 419, 102 S.Ct. 3164 (1982).

Loretto has no application to this case. The *Loretto* Court itself acknowledged that its holding "is very narrow," 458 U.S. at 441, 102 S.Ct. at 3179, and stated that: "[t]his Court has consistently affirmed that States have broad power to regulate housing conditions in general and the landlord-tenant relationship in particular without paying compensation for all economic injuries that such regulation entails." 458 U.S. at 440, 102 S.Ct. at 3178. *Accord Pennell v. City of San Jose*, 108 S.Ct. 849, 857–58 n.6 (1988); *F.C.C. v. Florida Power Corp.*, 107 S.Ct. 1107, 1112 (1987); *Fresh Pond Shopping Center, Inc. v. Callahan*, 464 U.S. 875, 104 S.Ct. 218 (1983).

Appellant's attempt to limit the application of *F.C.C. v. Florida Power Corp.* to rate regulation ignores the specific language of the Court that "statutes regulating the economic relations of landlords and tenants are not *per se* takings." 107 S.Ct. at 1112. The Connecticut decision is consistent with those of virtually every court since *Loretto* considering constitutional challenges similar to that made by appellant in finding that statutes regulating relations of landlords and tenants are not *per se* takings and, indeed, not takings at all. *See, e.g., Pennell v. City of San Jose*, 108 S.Ct. 849, 857–58, n.6 (1988); *F.C.C. v. Florida Power Corp.*, 107 S.Ct. 1107, 1112 (1987); *Fresh Pond Shopping Center, Inc. v. Callahan*, 464 U.S. 875, 104 S.Ct. 218 (1983); *Sadowsky v. City of New York*, 732 F.2d 312, 317 (2d Cir. 1984) (testing landlord-tenant regulation by the "multi-factor inquiry generally applicable to non-possessory governmental activity."); *Troy Ltd. v. Renna*, 727 F.2d 287, 302 (3d Cir. 1984) (statutory protection from eviction for certain tenants for forty years after conversion of apartments to condominiums, and eliminating eviction based

upon lapse of time); *Help Hoboken Housing v. City of Hoboken, N.J.*, 650 F. Supp. 793, 798 (D.N.J. 1986) (ordinance requiring landlords to rent vacant apartments to paying tenants); *Tirolerland, Inc. v. Lake Placid 1980 Olympic Games, Inc.*, 592 F. Supp. 304, 311 (N.D.N.Y. 1984) (statute allowing government agency to exercise preferential right of leasing motel and hotel rooms and to establish rates); *Edgewater Inv. Ass'n v. Borough of Edgewater*, 493 A.2d 11, 18 (N.J. Super. App. Div. 1985), *aff'd*, 510 A.2d 1178 (N.J. 1986) (statutory protections for class of tenants from conversion of rental apartments to condominiums).[1]

Even if one were to ignore the direct self-limiting words of *Loretto* and the action of the courts in rejecting application of *Loretto* to landlord-tenant relationships, the *Loretto* analysis is not properly applied to this case.

The adjustment of landlord-tenant rights by the Mobile Home Act is markedly different than the physical invasion analyzed in *Loretto* in several respects. The park landlord has *voluntarily* transferred the rights to possess and use the property to his tenant. The Mobile Home Act produces no physical invasion of the premises by persons other than tenants who were within the reasonable contemplation of the landlord who opened his park to the tenants. *Eamiello*, 208 Conn. at 642–43, 546 A.2d at 816–17.

The mobile home park owner suffers no invasion by a stranger, but by a tenant with whom he has voluntarily negotiated a rental agreement. The Mobile Home Act allows the landlord a large degree of control over the timing, extent and nature of the initial invasion. He can unilaterally elect

---

[1] This Court has limited broad application of a *Loretto* analysis in other types of regulation as well. In *Nollan v. California Coastal Commission*, 107 S.Ct. 3141 (1987), the Court noted that even a "permanent grant of continuous access" would *not* be a taking if it were a condition to a permit and designed to achieve the same goal as an outright permit denial. *Id.* at 3148. Thus, not all "permanent physical occupations" within the *Loretto* meaning are *per se* takings.

not to rent to a given tenant or to accept a given mobile home into the park, or even to rent a lot at all.

The landlord has a large degree of control over the subsequent purchaser's tenancy as well. Because the purchaser-tenant assumes the rights and obligations of the seller-tenant's rental agreement, and is bound by the park rules and regulations, the landlord has significant control over the timing, extent, and nature of the invasion by the purchaser-tenant.[2]

This Court, in *F.C.C. v. Florida Power Corp.*, specifically found that in a taking analysis there is an "unambiguous distinction between a commercial lessee and an interloper with a government license." 107 S.Ct. at 1112.

The Mobile Home Act is similar to the pole attachment statute at issue in *Florida Power.* As the Connecticut Supreme Court observed in *Eamiello*, a primary legislative purpose of the Mobile Home Act is the preservation of the tenant's financial investment in his mobile home. 208 Conn. at 648. Prior to the Act, landlords would often agree only to short term leases and then evict tenants, resulting in a sale of the mobile home to the landlord at distress prices. *Id.* Likewise, in response to complaints that commercial landlords were exploiting their monopoly position by engaging in widespread overcharging, Congress enacted the statutory and regulatory scheme challenged in *F.C.C. v. Florida Power Corp.*, 107 S.Ct. at 1110. The Court held that such economic regulation is a restriction on the use of property and not a physical occupation within the meaning of *Loretto*, emphasizing that the regulatory scheme became operative only after the landlord

---

[2] *See*, Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 21-79(a) and (d).

had affirmatively and voluntarily entered into a rental agreement.[3]

This case is also materially different than *Loretto* in the impact on the landlord's ability to dispose of his property. Section 21-80(b)(1)(E) allows the landlord to evict the tenant if he elects to change the use of his property. Thus, the landlord may dispose of his property, free and clear of any tenancy rights. Moreover, unlike *Loretto*, the mobile park owner may sell his land subject to the statutory tenancies and receive full value since the tenancy is a direct value to the owner.

This case is further distinguished from *Loretto* in that the restriction of a landlord's rights is not permanent in the same sense. The Mobile Home Act permits the park owner to evict a tenant for several reasons. Conn. Gen. Stat. § 21-80(b).

By allowing the particular occupant of the mobile home to change, section 21-79 does not alter or expand the character, nature, extent or duration of the physical invasion created

---

[3] Numerous examples exist where those voluntarily engaging in a regulated business or industry are subject to regulations extending their obligations which are not takings of property, *per se* or otherwise. *See e.g., Fresh Pond Shopping Center, Inc. v. Callahan*, 464 U.S. 875, 104 S.Ct. 218 (1983) (rent control, elimination of eviction based upon lapse of time, government permission required to remove property from rental market); *Block v. Hirsh*, 256 U.S. 135, 41 S.Ct. 458 (1921) (restriction on evicting holdover tenants); *Hilton Washington Corp. v. District of Columbia*, 777 F.2d 47 (D.C. Cir. 1985) (where hotel establishes taxicab stand, it cannot exclude any licensed taxicab); *Minnesota Ass'n. of Health Care Facilities, Inc. v. Minnesota Dept. of Public Welfare*, 742 F.2d 442 (8th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1215, 105 S.Ct. 1191 (1985) (nursing home operators who accept medicaid patients are subject to rate setting for private pay patients); *Troy Ltd. v. Renna*, 727 F.2d 287 (3d Cir. 1984) (statutory tenancies after expiration of lease); *Swann v. Gastonia Housing Authority*, 675 F.2d 1342 (4th Cir. 1982) (landlord who rents to federally subsidized § 8 tenants prohibited from evicting without cause upon expiration of § 8 lease); *Ballstaedt v. Amoco Oil Co.*, 509 F. Supp. 1095 (N.D. Iowa 1981) (required renewal of franchise absent good cause for termination); *Matter of Review of Health Care Admin.*, 415 A.2d 1147 (N.J. 1980), *cert. denied*, 449 U.S. 944, 101 S.Ct. 342 (1980) (nursing home operators required to make beds available to indigent patients).

by the initial placement of the mobile home within the park for the useful life of the mobile home, or until the tenant commits cause for eviction.[4]

Loretto specifically noted that its holding does not apply to leasehold extensions, citing *Edgar A. Levy Leasing Co. v. Siegel*, 258 U.S. 242, 246–48, 42 S.Ct. 289, 291–92 (1922) and *Block v. Hirsh*, 256 U.S. 135, 153–58, 41 S.Ct. 459–60 (1921); 458 U.S. at 440, 102 S.Ct. at 3178. *See also, Marcus Brown Holding Co. v. Feldman*, 256 U.S. 170, 41 S.Ct. 465 (1921); *Troy Ltd. v. Renna*, 727 F.2d 287, 301 (3d Cir. 1984). The Mobile Home Act's allowing a tenant to transfer the benefits of leasehold extensions to a subsequent purchaser in no way transmutes this case into a *per se* taking.

> The additional right to transfer to a mobile home purchaser the right to continued occupancy of the site, subject to rejection of the transferee for good cause as provided in § 21-79(d), is quite similar to the common provision that a landlord may not unreasonably withhold his consent to the assignment of a lease by a tenant. Such a statutorily required condition of a lease agreement similarly does not amount to a taking of property for a use never consented to by the owner, as in *Loretto*.

Eamiello, 208 Conn. at 646, 546 A.2d at 818. If the underlying tenancy restrictions are not *per se* takings, the transfer of the rights of tenancy to a subsequent purchaser of the mobile home alters only the particular tenant who will enjoy those rights. It does not alter or expand the restrictions of the park owner's rights to use, possess and dispose of its property.

---

[4] Section 21-80(b) creates no right in the tenant to replace a mobile home he has physically located within the park with any other mobile home, absent the landlord's consent. This statute prevents eviction based upon lapse of time only for the duration of the useful life of the mobile home.

Thus, when distilled to its essence, appellant's real complaint is that, having chosen to use its property for mobile home tenancy, it is deprived of the unfettered ability to choose and exclude *particular* tenants. It is well settled that a landlord has no "right" to select its tenants as he sees fit, free from governmental regulation. *Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States,* 379 U.S. 241, 259, 85 S.Ct. 348, 358 (1964), *cited by Loretto,* 458 U.S. at 440, 1025 S.Ct. at 3178. The restriction of this "right" does not constitute a taking. *Tirolerland, Inc. v. Lake Placid 1980 Olympic Games, Inc.,* 592 F. Supp. 304, 314 n.7 (N.D.N.Y. 1984). *See, Fresh Pond Shopping Center, Inc. v. Callahan,* 104 S.Ct. 218 (1983); *Pruneyard Shopping Center v. Robins,* 447 U.S. 74, 82–83, 100 S.Ct. 2035, 2041–42 (1980); *Hilton Washington Corp. v. District of Columbia,* 777 F.2d 47 (D.C. Cir. 1985); *Troy Ltd. v. Renna,* 727 F.2d 287 (3d Cir. 1984). This limited restriction on the bundle of property rights does not create a "physical occupation" of the type characterized as *per se* by *Loretto.*

Thus, the Connecticut Supreme Court correctly held that the Mobile Home Act's "modification of the common law right of the lessor to absolute control of the term of the lease and the identity of his lessee . . . is not sufficiently analogous to a physical occupation of property" as in *Loretto. Eamiello,* 208 Conn. at 641, 546 A.2d at 816. Under such circumstances, a *per se* taking analysis is wholly inappropriate.

The Decision Below Does Not Conflict With *Hall v. City of Santa Barbara.*

Hall v. City of Santa Barbara, 833 F.2d 1270 (9th Cir. 1987), *cert. denied,* 108 S.Ct. 1120 (1988), is inapposite, and does not broaden the *per se* taking rule of *Loretto* to apply to the Connecticut Statutes.

Hall does not attempt to decide the issues presented in this case. The Court emphasized that: "[W]e cannot and do not express any view as to whether the Santa Barbara

ordinance constitutes a taking. We hold only that . . . it *may*." 833 F.2d at 1282 (emphasis added). *Hall*, thus, is not intended to be that panel's final analysis of the taking issue.

To the extent *Hall* expresses opinions about the impact of the Santa Barbara regulatory scheme, it is inapposite. At issue in *Hall* was the impact of a rent control ordinance coupled with statutory tenancies. The *Hall* plaintiffs claimed that the rent control overlay took an economic value away from them and gave it to the tenants. The claim was that a tenant had the right to sell his tenancy at a premium reflecting the below-market rental rate, and achieve the economic value that was being denied to the landlord by rent control. In this circumstance, plaintiffs complained of "the transfer of a valuable property right to occupy mobile home parks at below-market rates." 833 F.2d at 1274. The transfer to the tenant of this salable economic value denied to the landlord by rent control was "crucial" to the *Hall* opinion. 833 F.2d at 1279.

By contrast, the Connecticut Mobile Home Act does not transfer to the tenant the economic value of a right denied to the landlord. The Connecticut Act has no below-market value rent control provisions. The landlord is free to extract its economic due for its property interest by way of rent. What the Mobile Home Act does is prevent the transfer of the tenant's investment in his mobile home to the landlord by virtue of the landlord's economic dominance. In other words, the Mobile Home Act does not take the landlord's property, but rather, prevents the landlord from taking the tenant's property. *Hall* is thus inapposite.

Furthermore, *Hall's* efficacy is questionable. Three other members of the Ninth Circuit, dissenting from the denial of rehearing *en banc*, found the *Hall* analysis "contrary to controlling authority." 833 F.2d at 1282 (Schroeder, J., dissenting from denial of *en banc* rehearing). The dissenting panel found further that the *Hall* decision was "antithetical to the reasoning of *Loretto*," 833 F.2d at 1283, and attacked the

opinion for encouraging "the very 'dire consequences' that the [Supreme] Court intended to avoid in *Loretto*" when it held that the *Loretto* rationale did not apply to adjustments of the landlord-tenant relationship. 833 F.2d at 1284, *citing Loretto*, 458 U.S. at 440, 102 S.Ct. at 3178. The efficacy of *Hall's* holding that the ordinances "seem to present a claim for taking by physical possession, as in *Loretto*," 833 F.2d at 1276, is further undermined by *Pennell v. City of San Jose*, 108 S.Ct. 849, 857-58 n.6 (1988), in which the Supreme Court made clear that regulation of the economic relations of landlords and tenants is not a *per se* taking under *Loretto*.

Hall's inapposite facts, tentative conclusions and questioned authority cannot be read to create a conflict in authority with the decision of the Connecticut Supreme Court.

The Mobile Home Act Is Well Within The Legitimate Police Power.

The appellant claims that the Connecticut Supreme Court failed to determine whether the Mobile Home Act substantially advances legitimate state interests. Appellant does *not* take issue with the Court below's balancing of the Act's purpose against the economic harm caused to appellant by operation of the Act. Rather, appellant's sole basis for disagreement with the Connecticut Supreme Court's balancing test is appellant's claim that the Mobile Home Act is not within the legitimate police power of the State of Connecticut. However, the opinion below details the legislative history that demonstrates that the Mobile Home Act "serves a substantial public purpose." *Eamiello*, 208 Conn. at 648, 546 A.2d at 819.

The Connecticut Supreme Court noted that due to municipal zoning ordinances enacted state-wide, mobile home park owners have achieved a fortuitous monopoly and that "throughout society monopolies often result in abuses." *Eamiello*, 208 Conn. at 647, 546 A.2d at 819. The Court

below recounted the various legislative studies that formed the basis for enactment of the Mobile Home Act, citing the most recent (1983) study's finding that prohibitions of on-site resale "prohibits [mobile home] owners from obtaining equity from their housing investment." *Eamiello*, 208 Conn. at 648, 546 A.2d at 819. The Connecticut Supreme Court found that "[s]ection 21-79 of the Mobile Home Act protects tenants at mobile home parks from being forced to sell to park owners at a substantial loss and as a consequence benefits many low income people who cannot otherwise afford to purchase more expensive housing." *Eamiello*, 208 Conn. at 648, 546 A.2d at 819. The Court below held that "in choosing the tenant rather than the mobile home park operator as the recipient of the economic advantage arising from the near-monopoly status of the industry, the legislature, by allotting its benefit to those who generally are more in need has not violated any constitutional principle." *Eamiello*, 208 Conn. at 649, 546 A.2d at 820.

The Mobile Home Act thus serves a substantial public purpose. Moreover, the Act does not achieve its objective unfairly to the appellant.

The character of the governmental action only becomes a factor which tips in favor of establishing a taking when the action "forc[es] some people alone to bear public burdens, which, in all fairness and justice, should be borne by the public as a whole." *Connolly v. Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp.*, 106 S.Ct. 1018, 1027 (1986), *quoting Armstrong v. United States*, 364 U.S. 40, 49, 80 S.Ct. 1563, 1569 (1960). However, when a person has voluntarily entered a business and receives the economic benefit thereof, "fairness and justice" do not require the public, rather than the business person, to shoulder protections afforded the business person's customer to prevent over-reaching. *See Connolly v. Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp.*, 1106 S.Ct. at 1026-27.

Thus, the Mobile Home Act recognizes that tenants of mobile home parks who have a sizeable investment in mobile homes require protection from economically dominant park

owners who would otherwise usurp the tenants' investments. The Mobile Home Act is designed to render to the park owner his economic due by way of rent, but to prevent the park owner from reaching too far into the tenant's pocketbook. In addition, the Act provides regulatory oversight of mobile home parks. Such regulatory adjustment of economic benefits and burdens is squarely within the legitimate police power of the state, and no serious federal question regarding the police power exists. *See Pennell v. City of San Jose,* 108 S.Ct. 849, 858 (1988); *Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff,* 467 U.S. 229, 241–42, 104 S.Ct. 2321, 2330 (1984); *Exxon Corp. v. Governor of Maryland,* 437 U.S. 117, 124–25, 98 S.Ct. 2207, 2213 (1978); *Block v. Hirsh,* 256 U.S. 135, 154–56, 41 S.Ct. 458, 459 (1921).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should dismiss the appeal because it was not timely filed, and for want of a substantial question, or, in the alternative, summarily affirm.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD G. FITZPATRICK, ESQ.
175 Church Street
Suite 301
Naugatuck, Connecticut 06770
Tel: (203) 729-4555

Attorney for Appellee